

**WHOIS Study Group
Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 6 May 2008 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the WHOIS Study Group teleconference on May 6, 2008, at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-whois-study-group-20080506.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

Present:

David Maher, Ken Stubbs - (RyC) Stéphane Van Gelder, James Bladel, Tim Ruiz - (Registrars), Steve Metalitz - (IPC), Wendy Seltzer - ALAC
Liaison to ICANN Board, Norbert Klein - NCUC, Steve DelBianco - CBUC,
Tony Harris - ISP,

Absent excused:

Beau Brendler,

Staff

Liz Gasster, Glen de Saint Géry GNSO Secretariat,

Coordinator: Excuse me, (James Bladel) now joins.

(James Bladel): Good morning.

Glen DeSaintgery: Hi, (James). This is Glen.

(Tony Harris): Good morning, everyone. (Tony Harris).

Glen DeSaintgery: We - hi, (Tony).

So we've got (James Bladel) and yourself on the line.

Man: Okay. Thank you.

Coordinator: Excuse me, (Wendy Seltzer) now joins.

Glen DeSaintgery: Hello, (Wendy), welcome.

Wendy Seltzer: Thank you (unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: We've got (James Bladel) and (Tony Harris) on the line.

Wendy Seltzer: Oh, (unintelligible) (nice quick call then).

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Man: (Thank you).

Coordinator: Excuse me, Norbert Klein now joins.

Glen DeSaintgery: Welcome, (Norbert). Welcome, (Tim).

Tim Ruiz: Hello, everybody.

((Crosstalk))

(Norbert Klein): Hello. Welcome.

Woman: (Hello).

Glen DeSaintgery: I'm glad you could get on to the line, (Norbert).

Norbert Klein : It seems to be okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Good.

Norbert Klein : There was a big rain in the afternoon, but it's over now.

Glen DeSaintgery: Good.

Hi, (Steve).

(Steve Del Bianco): Hello, Glen. How are you?

Glen DeSaintgery: Fine, thank you. And you?

(Steve Del Bianco): I'm very good. I'm surprised there's just two of us. I thought we'd
have...

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery: No. No, no, no. We've got Norbert Klein , Tim Ruiz, Wendy Seltzer,
(Tony Harris), (James Liddell), and myself. So we're having quite a
crowd today.

(Liz): Hello?

Glen DeSaintgery: Hi, (Liz).

(Liz): Hi, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Liz), we have on the line (Steve Del Bianco), Norbert Klein , Tim Ruiz, Wendy Seltzer, (Tony Harris), and (James Bladel).

(Liz): Hey. Yeah. Hey, (Alice) leave you the wrong conference.

Glen DeSaintgery: And (David Maher).

(Liz): Oh, great. Okay. I don't know if others were having difficulty, too.

But I was, you know, first, I was on hold for a while, and then I was in the wrong conference.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...(an interesting one)?

(Liz): Yeah. They were quite resentful...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): ...I was there.

So perhaps we should go ahead and begin. Can everyone hear me okay?

Man: Yeah.

(Liz): Okay, great.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Dave), would you like...

(David Morje): Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...to - oh, are you on, (Jeremy)?

Coordinator: Yes. At this time, would you like to begin the recording?

(Liz): Yes, that would be great. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you. I will go ahead and begin the recording for the call. It will take just one moment.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Liz), I believe there's a lot of echo coming from your line.

(Liz): Oh, can (Jeremy) check that, too?

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay, I'll (have it fixed)...

(Liz): Or I can dial back in. But I've got it.

Coordinator: The call is being recorded at this time.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Jeremy)? Sorry, this is Glen.

Coordinator: Yes?

Glen DeSaintgery: (Liz) has got a lot of echo on her line. Is there something we could do about it?

Coordinator: I can't fix that. What she will need to do is dial back in...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Sorry, everyone. I'll give that a try. Bear with us.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Hello? Hi. This is Steve Metalitz.

Glen DeSaintgery: Hi, (Steve). Welcome.

Steve Metalitz: Hi.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Liz) is just dialing back in again because she has had a lot of echo on her line.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I was placed in the wrong conference first. So maybe, other people have had that experience.

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh, yes. (Liz) had the same problem.

Stéphane: Yeah, this is Stéphane and I had the same problem. Hello, everybody.

I got a conference on the problems of insurance, I think, or something like that.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: (Engine risk) or something.

Stéphane: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Some kind of (unintelligible).

Norbert Klein : This is (Norbert). I didn't have problems. I landed immediately here.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): ...(Wendy) and I...

Steve Metalitz: Lucky.

(Liz): ...were just (as happily) be talking about (engine risk).

Well if we have tremendous success on this call, we can move on to other topics.

This is (Liz). I'm back. Does it sound better?

Man: Yeah, that's fine.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

(Liz): That's great.

Well thanks, everyone, for joining today. First, let me make sure that everyone received the draft (tally) and also the initial mapping of the GAC studies.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Did anyone not receive that?

Okay.

Does anyone have any corrections or changes to make on either of those documents?

Okay.

Just one more comment.

(First), (the topic of) - Iron Mountain is no longer going to be participating, and so just - I will be deleting her name from this (tally). So I didn't want to confuse people. So that'll be an upcoming version.

And - but if no one else has any corrections or...

Man: I have a question, (Liz).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thanks. This is on the GAC...

(Liz): Yes.

Man: ...the mapping of the GAC recommendation...

(Liz): Okay.

Man: ...against, you know, the numbered proposals for WHOIS study.

(Liz): Yeah.

Man: You go through the notion of indicating, for instance, on products and services, that they're related to Study Submission Number 2, and then down below suggested it's not covered by previous proposals.

So I'm missing the - that's contradictory, right? Either it's - either they sort of mapped Study Submission 2 or they're not covered at all or is it somewhere in between?

(Liz): Are you talking about availability of products and services 7 and 8?

Man: That's right.

(Liz): Yeah. No, they should be related to Study Submission Number 2.

Man: Right.

(Liz): Oh, I see, where you're talking about...

Man: The bottom of the page and it says 3 is not covered by previous proposals. Do I - am I reading that wrong?

(Liz): It would be 3 of the GAC recommendations.

Man: Not Number 3?

(Liz): Not Number 3 of our recommendations. So 3 of GAC's recommendations, which is our technical measures available that could affect the (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you.

(Liz): And believe me...

Norbert Klein : This is (Norbert).

(Liz): ...double-check me if you see anything that doesn't seem quite right in the mapping - thanks for double-checking me and I'm happy to make any corrections that anybody finds.

So...

Norbert Klein : This is (Norbert).

((Crosstalk))

Norbert Klein : (Liz), I don't think I got the GAC-related document.

(Liz): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll send it to you

(Liz): Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you.

Norbert Klein : (Now if you)...

(Liz): (What we want) to do with the GAC-related document - well, probably, we won't try to do it today, but we want to make sure that we do is to take into consideration all of the recommendations that are made by the GAC in the context of our overall effort.

So, you know, that's the goal to, you know, when we identify our recommendations, that it includes and consider the recommendations made by the GAC as well.

(Steve Del Bianco): This is (Steve). I have a request then...

(Liz): Sure.

(Steve Del Bianco): ...on the draft tally that WHOIS group used, could you add a row at the bottom and separate from our voting, of course, but a row at the bottom that just says GAC's recommendation. Then you could map their recommendations to the seven columns on your table so we know where they fit in.

(Liz): Can you just say that again, (Steve)? Sorry.

(Steve Del Bianco): The second document you circulated with the draft tally of our study group (use).

(Liz): Right.

(Steve Del Bianco): (See)? And in there, we have the registry constituency and all the rest of the folks voting.

(Liz): Right.

(Steve Del Bianco): And I would ask that if you add another row to that table called GAC Recommendations, it isn't for the purpose of the voting but it helps to inform us where the GAC maps versus the rest of us.

(Liz): Oh, I see what you're saying, to just indicate the numbers there.

(Steve Del Bianco): That's right. That's right.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): The only thing that would be, I think, not consistent would be that these are actually your relative priority levels where...

(Steve Del Bianco): Well do you infer...

(Liz): ...the GAC is just...

(Steve Del Bianco): ...that the GAC recommendations are in priority order?

(Liz): I infer that?

(Steve Del Bianco): Do - should we infer that the GAC...

(Liz): I would...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): ...not necessarily infer that unless you...

(Steve Del Bianco): I don't actually know. But we could ask. We could ask (Suzanne) if that's what they meant by that.

(Liz): Okay.

(Steve Del Bianco): Put it this way then. If we were to map it, we don't have to necessarily map their priority in terms of high to low, but some indication whether anything in Column 1, 2, 3 through 7 maps to the GAC.

(Liz): Yeah. What I was actually thinking, (Steve) -- tell me if you think this would accomplish the same goals because I'm just worried that that might be confusing in the tally context -- is to actually add the GAC recommendations to the chart in the summary so that when you see all -- for example, all the first category, you would also see study suggestions, you know, whatever number from the GAC as well on the list, so that we'd have one - I think what you're trying to get at is one list that would reflect all the GAC recommendations as well as all the other recommendations.

(Steve Del Bianco): Yes, that would...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): And maybe there would be a way to do that more cleanly in a chart that is more like the other documents.

(Steve Del Bianco): Yeah, that would be helpful.

(Liz): Okay, okay. So I'll play with that a little bit because I do think the idea of having sort of all these studies at a glance in one document would be a lot easier than going back and forth.

Okay.

I don't have a perfect answer for today's call. Let me just quickly start with a couple of mechanics.

(Norbert) and (Tony), I think you're both on this call. Do either of you plan to provide your priority order of categories? Each of the other participants in this group has told us of the seven categories of WHOIS studies that have been suggested by various contributors of what their view of the priority order of those studies should be. And I just want to note whether I should expect that input from either of you.

(Tony Harris): You go first, (Norbert).

Norbert Klein : Yeah, this is (Norbert).

Actually, (Robin) had already sent in our list of the seven (unintelligible)...

(Liz): Okay.

Norbert Klein : ...categories.

(Liz): Perfect.

Norbert Klein : But I'm not sure whether this was (refused) because...

(Liz): Yes, we did get (Robyn's)...

((Crosstalk))

Norbert Klein : ...(unintelligible) were not on the last list.

(Liz): Okay. We did get (Robyn's) and I just wasn't sure whether I should associate your views with (Robyn's) identically or not.

Norbert Klein : Yes, yes. We had agreed on that.

(Liz): Okay.

Norbert Klein : Thank you.

(Liz): Then I'll make that note on a subsequent update.

(Tony)?

Norbert Klein : Yeah.

(Tony Harris): Yes. Well, I'm in a catching-up mode, I'm afraid. I've been out of the office for the last month. And so I haven't been participating.

I don't want to hold people back. We will discuss this and as soon as possible give an opinion. But as I say, I don't think it's fair that I should hold other people back if you're moving forward on this.

(Liz): Okay. Well it would be useful to have your input whenever you can provide it, but the sooner the better.

What I think we should do today is, again, kind of focus in on the categories rather than the specific studies and see if we can have some discussion that would bring us closer to a recommendation on specific categories of studies that we do or do not think should be recommended by this group.

And I'd like to say I have a perfect way to have that discussion and I don't. So if others have views about how to, you know, facilitate a discussion where we try to get to a consensus around what the categories of studies are that we promote, I would be very receptive to that.

One thing that occurs to me is just to try to take the easier ones first. For example, I'm not sure if (Bowe) is on the call, but when you look at the Category Number 7 for WHOIS accuracy, others (in those) (Bowe's) boat, it looks like it's a fairly low priority for the rest of you given the other options.

One way to start might be just to agree that of all the recommendations, that one falls to the bottom of the list, which isn't to say that we're yet making a decision about whether it should be done at all or not.

I think one of the reasons why this fell to the bottom overall is that WHOIS accuracy studies are already being conducted by ICANN. Whether they are of the breadth or depth that people feel are needed, you know, may be uncertain, but let me just stop there and see if folks have a comment about either how to proceed generally or whether we can sort of tick these off one by one and focus in on just, you know, just how to discuss them individually.

Man: Yeah.

Stéphane: (Liz), can I just get in? It's Stéphane.

(Liz): Please.

Stéphane: Just on the general procedure, is it not possible just to kind of add up the tally from each one of us and see who gets the lowest score, which would mean have the priority?

(Liz): We can certainly do that. I was kind of hesitant to do it because this isn't an exact reflection of the world, you know, all of you. Those of you who have volunteered...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Sorry?

Man: I was going to say I agree with you...

(Liz): Yeah.

Man: This is not a voting issue.

(Liz): Yeah. It's more, you know, a way of discussing issue because we don't really have exact representation of all the constituencies and then we have some that are individuals, which I think is wonderful and I want to discourage any of that participation but we're, you know, we've got a...

Man: I wasn't suggesting about just the way of kind of identifying those issues that are the most important, too...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Yeah. So that - in a way that what I was doing by suggesting number 7 drop (off).

Man: Yeah.

(Liz): Because if you look at it...

Tim Ruiz: Excuse me, this is (Tim)?

(Liz): Yes, (Tim).

Tim Ruiz: Can I make a comment?

(Liz): Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: ...keep in mind, and I'm not sure how to view it is that, but there's like a (637) different people participating who don't think any of these things should be pursued.

So that whatever we come - whatever you do is coming up with an average of whatever. It's only going to reflect a certain segment of the people involved in this call.

(Liz): That's right.

Tim Ruiz: And...

(Liz): That's right. And I think we have to...

Tim Ruiz: (Unintelligible) you do explain that way (so it's clear).

(Liz): That's right. That's kind of a threshold thing we talked about last week and we should refresh our collective memory on it (probably) every week because that we have, for lack of a better term, a substantial number of people who do not think any study should proceed.

And in the documents that we send to the council and in our discussions, you know, we have to keep that in mind throughout. I don't know how else to know that other than the way it's noted on this document.

But - and when we get to the report stage, you know, it's got to have to be noted upfront in the report if there is a substantial number of the participants who do not think studies should proceed.

That said, I don't think...

((Crosstalk))

(Wendy): So, can I jump for...

(Liz): Please.

Man: This is (Steve Mittal) (unintelligible) in the queue.

(Liz): Okay, let's start in queue.

Was that, (Wendy)?

(Wendy): Yes, please.

(Liz): And then (Steve) and who else?

Okay, (Wendy)?

(Wendy): Yeah. So I wanted to follow on that note of lack of support for studies or in trying to understand where the studies will be helpful. One way of prioritizing might be to think more about how the studies will be used in the policy process and while we had said that we can't hear bind the constituencies to doing something in response to any particular findings that might out of studies.

Can we, at least, in our (passive) long-term participants in this process go a little bit beyond what the studies proponent said they could be used for in the policy process to have a discussion of given the range

of results we might find from a study, what might we do with those findings and where would I can actually go as a result of learning more about these areas?

Woman: Just making notes, thanks.

(Steve)?

(Steve): Yes, I was going to get back to your original question about how to proceed. I agree with you that there are - I guess there are two categories here, number seven and number two, that are good candidates to be dropped to the bottom. Number seven, as you mentioned (Bowe) had that number two, and I guess (Bowe) is not on the call, I assume.

Woman: Right.

(Steve): So it would be good to hear from him before we take action on that.

Number two, no one has put it in their top 3. Let's put it that way. So not everybody's first, second, or third priority.

So that's, (against), and of course we also have seven people who don't like it because they don't want any studies

So that would be another good candidate, I think, to go to the bottom. I don't think there's any others that were - nobody has ranked it in the top 3. So, yeah, it gets harder after that, but at least that's a good first step, I think.

Woman: Great.

Any...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) (get into)?

(Liz): Sure. (Steve)?

(Steve): (I do want to) share that when I ranked something as a seven, for instance, the WHOIS accuracy, it wasn't that I don't think it's needed but that someone else is talking care of it. I'm not going to say I was that rigorous on all of them. For some I just didn't think of what is important. But...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Right, you don't want to convey the idea that it shouldn't be done by be-leading it or placing it low. Is that your point?

(Steve): Right, and that maybe true the WHOIS accuracy studies because there are audits going on.

(Liz): Right.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): I suspect that's why most people put it there, so...

((Crosstalk))

Man: When we explore how people voted in a discussion way, let's just understand whether we believe it was ranked poorly because we either don't need it at all or being otherwise provided for.

(Liz): Okay.

Stéphane: (Liz), it's Stéphane.

(Liz): Sure, Stéphane.

Stéphane: Yeah, just to clarify.

My take on it was actually to rank that in order of importance for me. And the once that I didn't rank it all as I mentioned in my email I thought shouldn't be considered for study.

So that - as far as my way of doing it was to give it a priority ranking and the ones that are lower, I didn't expect others to handle but just I felt they were less important.

(Liz): Okay, thank you.

Any other...

((Crosstalk))

(Steve): This is (Steve Mittal).

So I just associate myself with (Steve Del Biaco) about Category 7, and also I'm going to have to drop off the call now. I'll try to get back on later.

(Liz): Okay, thanks (Steve).

Okay. Well with the caveat that we want to go back to (Bowe) and ask him about his vote on seven, is there a general agreement then that this should not be one of the recommendations that we support? In other words, we would explain as has been said before? That in this case it's already being done and therefore this group doesn't recommend it as part of the (unintelligible). Okay.

How about number two? (Steve Mittal's) suggestion about it it's not in anyone's top 3.

Man: Yeah, that could be draw.

(Liz): Okay. And again, you know, we're not dropping him off the face of the earth. We're, you know, trying to get to the most important.

Man: Yeah, to narrow it down a bit.

Man: Yeah.

(Liz): Right, right. And now narrow it down.

So I think with (Wendy's) suggestion in mind, it does make sense to talk about the remaining five in the content of, you know, how they could benefit or inform to the dates.

I think we could certainly start with what people have put forward as the benefits and rationale for those, but it does strike me that it make sense to go through these remaining five and begin to have a discussion about some - what priority order we would put them in.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): So any suggestions about do we want to just start with number one or there's a - do we want to start maybe with the, you know, one of the areas that you all think should be rated top priority?

Man: Maybe start with number one.

(Liz): Okay.

Man: (Liz), (Steve Del Bianco) would have mentioned it by setting aside number two, if you turn to your GAC recommendations, it seems to imply that based on - they felt strongly about this compliance with data protection laws at the GAC.

(Liz): Right.

Man: I want to (over-read) that but will they believe that we're sort of discing them by just ignoring number two. And maybe we don't care but...

(Liz): Other thoughts about that?

Stéphane: Stéphane again.

I certainly wouldn't feel the necessity to be - to take into account what the GAC might think at this stage.

I understand where the comment might be coming from and why to vote to, at least, anticipate what others might think. But I think we should just proceed on our own and according to our own judgment first and try and get some sort of pattern out of that before taking into account what others might show me the way. I mean, people feeling upset about our choices, and don't think should be considered at this time.

(Liz): Yeah.

One thing that might make sense though is to just spend a very brief amount of time talking about why we don't think this is useful. So, you know, it comes to my needing to do a response to the GAC on explaining our rationale there. I have a good way of (foundation) for expressing what that might be.

((Crosstalk))

(Wendy): This is (Wendy) here.

Man: ...(Steve).

((Crosstalk))

Man: In answering entering that question, I might offer this, the GAC (apps) sort of a clinical question about hearing our policies as they just on paper to data protection laws. But a lot of what studies three and four

and six are about - categories three, four, six is to say that whatever ICANN's written policy is, it is permitted the evolution of privacy protection services so that citizens of countries can take advantage of ways of shielding their identity.

And therefore for GAC to ask, well what's the letter of our current policy compared to data the (complexion) laws. That would miss the kind of services that have evolved over time to provide protection.

So it might be a question just premature, I would say, to the GAC is that until we take a look at what our people actually doing, what are natural persons actually doing on the Internet and can they shield themselves in areas where they're not doing commercial activity. If the answer to that were yes, then it sorts of a move point whether the written policy complies or not with data protection laws.

(Wendy): It was just (Wendy).

And I was going to make a different suggestion, which is (unintelligible) already been my subject of study earlier in the development of the WHOIS and national laws, compliance policies earlier and has lead to a policy, which the GAC found itself unable to offer any advise one way or the other, but...

(Liz): And this is the conflict, the conflict policy that...

(Wendy): That's right. Yeah.

(Liz): See, that's what I was kind of wondering, too.

I guess, (Steve), you could attribute this to a number of different things. Like one thing I've heard is that enforcement is very uneven as well in countries. So, you know, it could be that it's already been looked at. It could be that countries have (unintelligible) so these countries have other ways of protecting their privacy. It could also be that it's not (unintelligible) worse consistency. Their numbers are different potential...

Woman: And one more thought, it would also sound, but it's difficult to gather (unintelligible) if anybody with regard as authoritative information on this because if you get two lawyers in a room and they'll have different opinions and governments themselves don't give advisory opinions like - their legal bodies wait for a case to come up where their judicial bodies wait for a case to come before a court and to give a decision on the particular case.

So often you can't get an abstract. Does this conflict that wait till somebody sues, claim and conflict, and then you'll see whether it does or doesn't.

(Liz): Yeah, yeah.

Okay, good. That's very helpful.

So let's go back. We're close to with our rationale. At least get you out a bit there.

Let's go to one. So this is - who has misused also including the second bullet on the GAC. And...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): So this was one that (Robin) and (Norbert) rated very high that several others...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): ...of you rated for the in between.

Tim Ruiz: (Liz), this is (Tim). Can I...

(Liz): Please, (Tim).

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. Can we just back up just for a moment to the - to where we were discussing the one that we just agreed to drop, which was two and seven, right?

(Liz): Right.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. And then, I would suggest that number six as well simply because, you know, regardless of the ranking the majority of the participants who don't feel that that should be pursued.

Back to only seven, I think, actually would give it any ranking at all, but I think that may be another one that doesn't appear to have the (no) support within this group.

(Steve): This is (Steve) (unintelligible). So you're saying Category 6 on the proxy compliance?

Tim Ruiz: Right.

(Steve): And see, one, two, three, four of the six people that gave numbers ranked it in their top 3. So I don't think we should read that as a lack of support for Category 6.

Tim Ruiz: Well if - then how do we take those who didn't rank the other ones and do account to adjust...

(Steve): I concur that that is a...

((Crosstalk))

(Steve): ...perplexing question.

((Crosstalk))

(Steve): That is perplexing question, but...

((Crosstalk))

(Steve): ...there's no way that the numbers were justified six falling off the table given that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's not true.

(If you look at) - simply put, regardless of how it's ranked, the majority of the people involved in this group did not feel it necessary to pursue

(six, four, seven). So you know, I think that is probably the more important issue before we get down into the ranking. It's the majority...

((Crosstalk))

(Steve): Or you read to know. You just tell - tell us how you're doing your math there. Are you just telling up the no?

Man: Just looking at the chart. And even if you take into account that (Tony) didn't actually rank anything that would still only be, you know, eight...

(Steve): You're saying that given that there are seven to eight no's in that column, it fails to get any support. And if that was your rationale, they all fail.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (What's the same), (Steve), is there are 11 no's in that column.

(Liz): Well again, I think this is a flaw...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): ...in looking too much...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): ...at the numbers.

Man: And out of the 18 no's in that column.

You got to - the registries only have one no and all three was saying no...

(Liz): Yeah, I mean, you know, we're trying to stay away from actually counting the votes here.

Man: Yeah, but I, you know, it seems like a subtle different between counting the votes (unintelligible) these rankings, because then just by totally discount those don't feel...

(Liz): Yeah, I'm trying to avoid (discounting) them as well.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): I think the purpose of the ranking was just to give people a barometer or indicia about where everyone where coming from...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I don't thin it's a fair representation to say, six should be considered, two and seven shouldn't...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Well I don't think we're saying yet that six should definitely be considered. I think what we're saying is that, you know, one, three, four, five, and six should be discussed at greater depth amongst us and try to see if we can get them into collect and priority order whereas the recommendation so far and that's what we're discussing is that two

and seven don't seem to have the support to - for different reasons to move forward.

Man: And so if you consider the, you know, that those who didn't rank, you know, that they consider all these the lowest priority and (unintelligible), you know, seven instead of a no, you know, that's going to put six down there pretty close to the bottom of two and seven (unintelligible) lower than two.

(Liz): Yeah, that maybe. I think that maybe that there is less support for six than for one, three, four, and five.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): But I think that's to be determined as we talk about it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, less support (unintelligible) two.

(Liz): Less support than two you say?

Man: Yes, because you can't just totally discount the 10 people on (either) - we're saying, this should be pursued at all.

So you know, you give that a seven then you dropped down below two. And you're saying that if we're going to say two and seven, we're just going to take out the next and six goes out of the next, and so just as low rank, there's two and seven, and how you want - you guys how you want to look at it actually?

(Liz): Well I think actually it'd be helpful for the registries to weigh in here because they were clearly saying that, you know, we're possibly some reasons to proceed with two, but not with six.

(Ken Stubb): (Liz)?

(Liz): Yeah.

(Ken Stubb): Yeah. It's (Ken Stubb).

Just - I'm in complete agreement with (Tim) on six and seven on - in the case two, I think, somebody have to make a solid case for it before I think the registries could support two.

(Liz): Uh-huh.

(Ken Stubb): So I mean from a practical standpoint, I don't know what you're looking for from it.

(Liz): Yeah, yeah.

Well let's talk about six a little more.

(Norbert), I don't know if you, you know, you rated - you and (Robin) rated six pretty high. (Steve) and (Lee) and (Steve Del Bianco) rated it higher than others. Would you like to weigh in on, (Tim's)?

Man: And, (Steve), I would...

((Crosstalk))

Norbert Klein : This is (Norbert) (unintelligible).

Yeah. (Norbert), can I speak?

(Liz): Yeah, please, (Norbert).

Norbert Klein : We have it up in our selection in second position because we think there (unintelligible) law enforcement is always coming up. And some people say law enforcement is guaranteed. Some say it is not so clear. Therefore, I think it is worthwhile to get this if there is a study to get it studied in terms of, does it provide law enforcement necessities.

(Liz): Thank you.

(Steve Del Bianco): This is (Steve Del Bianco).

(Liz): Please, (Steve).

(Steve Del Bianco): The importance I attached to the proxy registrar compliance is (partly) a function, in fact that if we say that the marketplace created and privacy protection opportunities for people and in fact they're taking advantage of them, we'd like to know more about who's taking advantage of them and what numbers, which registrars are offering it.

And that lead you down a path that says, okay, for those that are picking to shield their data, shield their identity from privacy protection services like proxy, my goodness, is this a more - is this a hazard in

the sense that bad actors are using these very same shield to escape detection by law enforcement or (intellectual) property holders.

And the way you answer that question is (unintelligible) when registrar is offering proxy services are asked to reveal the identity on evidence of actionable harm, how quickly and accurately do they do so?

So you almost have to do six, Category 6 if you're going to look at three and four. So to me, three, four, and six sort of really fit together.

Man: (Liz), would you bring...

((Crosstalk))

(Steve Del Bianco): ...off of that, but thank you.

(Liz): So, (Kim), who else is in the queue?

Tim Ruiz: (Tim).

(Liz): (Tim), who else?

Okay, (Tim).

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. I guess, first of all, you know, I can't help but I'm a (CPA). I always look at the concept of materiality, you know, I think in the case of six, I would be - before I go any further with that, I would want to know how material the purported breaches are, you know, we have a tens of millions of domains out there, if the - I'll use the same argument on - that the - I believe it was the study with - put out by the

Department of Commerce or by one of those organizations, where they looked at whether or not people were using WHOIS data for spamming and they said it wasn't material.

Before we go any further with number six, I need to be satisfied that there purported breaches are material enough to justify going any further into this, you know. If we have a problem, how big of a problem is it, you know, rather than studying compliance first, let's talk about the problem.

Then if there is, we judge it there to be a significant problem, then we need to discuss how are they handling now in terms of compliance, then we can decide what we need to do in order to rectify the problem if we decide that the way they're handling it now is not adequate. (That's all).

Man: Could I ask you to clarify that, were you speaking of, for instance, doing Category 1 before you worry about something like Category 6? Did I misread you?

Woman: That was I wondering, too, actually. (That's it) (unintelligible).

1(Ken): Well I guess what I'd have to do, I'd have to look at Category 1 before I went too far, you know.

In other words, I'm tired of developing solutions to problems that may or not be there. I want to make sure that the problems that we have are clearly addressed and the materiality of the problems are brought forth.

Once we dealt with that, we could stratify which problems are most significant and how do we deal with that. We deal - we stratify it in two different ways, which problems are most significant in terms of volume and which problems are most significant in terms of impact.

I'm sorry, but law enforcement issues are significantly more impactful to me than intellectual property issue.

In fact if somebody has worked hard to get (and find the) UDRP is one thing. In fact, if somebody has to work too hard to find terrorism sites or sites involving material impacts on financial institutions and e-commerce is significantly more important to me, and I believe to the majority of the people in the community.

(Liz): Well, so (Ken), if I could just ask you then in the misused category, it sounds like what - I think the registries were supporting this study on spam (443), but there are other studies in that one category that look at other kinds of misuse like for phishing

1(Ken): Yeah, I just think, (Liz), it's very difficult to assess the impact. I understand the impact on - or at least I have a minor understanding of the impact on certain constituencies of some of these abuses.

But at the same point in time, I think we need to try to spend our time as efficiently as possible. And the most efficient way of dealing with it are dealing with the issues that have the greatest impact on the Internet community, and that's how I have to look at it.

(Liz): Okay.

Let's see, (Tim), you're next.

Tim Ruiz: (To just), you know, first in regard to the six having to be done as we do three, and four, I don't agree with that all. Three and four is about availability, demand and motivation.

And I perhaps could, (by a stretch), see an argument that if you do three and four and get certain answer then maybe six needs to (unintelligible).

But to say that, you know, they're tied together is not true at all. But still the bottom line is that there is no more support to six (unintelligible) to seven and less support for six (unintelligible) no matter how you want to (tally) it, no matter how you want to look at it that's the bottom line.

Man: Are we looking at the draft tally chart to make that conclusion?

Man: Right.

Man: I just want to make sure, (Tim), I...

Tim Ruiz: There's...

((Crosstalk))

Man:six then for seven.

Tim Ruiz: The ten people on there who do not want - who don't think that that should be pursued...

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: And of those who did want it...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...they rank six far, far higher than seven, right, of those who do want it.

So if you...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...just go with the simple majority that said no, then you're not even looking at the priority order of those who felt it should be done. Is that right?

Tim Ruiz: Exactly because that takes - to me that's the first look is that, (you know), the majority of this group doesn't feel it should be pursued and that should be - (if we're) going to be knocking things out of (unintelligible) the first consideration. Then of those where the majority feel, you know, these report should be pursued then the rankings (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: So something you have...

Tim Ruiz: Prior to that if you take into the ranking, then you're just ignoring the fact that 10 out of the 17 people who responded here don't feel it should be pursued at all.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...sort of a threshold issue before you even look at how it's prioritized. Is that right?

Man: Exactly. If there's - if the threshold is, you know, x and this doesn't meet x, then (unintelligible) how those who (unintelligible) who prioritizes it (unintelligible) what its development.

(Liz): So, (Tim), with - this is (Liz).

Without taking a position on, you know, the point about Category 6 or not. So the concern that I have about your conclusion about the majority is that we really didn't strive for any statistical balance in forming this through.

So I mean the truth of the matter is we could have five more registrars or five more IT people or, you know, we didn't try to engineer in any way the representation of this group in fact, you know, we're striving for exclusiveness and kind of welcomed everybody.

So I think there's...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: And, (Liz), but there has to be some way of accounting for and reporting (appropriately).

(Liz): You're right. To some way it's a struggle.

Tim Ruiz: There's a significant - not a significant number, a majority of the participants who didn't feel this report should be pursued. So I don't want to see happen is in the final report with saying well, here's how these reports are prioritized.

You know, it's got to be extremely clear that they're only prioritized as such amongst those who feel they should be pursued. And then there's those who don't feel that any should be pursued, but regardless of that even within those that are categorized, it needs to be clear that, you know, of those who did feel that should be pursued, they were the minority.

So if the minority who ranked this number six where it is, it's not the majority. That matter, it should be accounted for and I want to (unintelligible) say if we're going to drop seven and two because of the ranking and I want, you know, to hit my argument for why six should be dropped based on the lack of support from the people in this group. Otherwise, we're just, you know, we're going to down to sort of throwing out the consideration of those who don't think that maybe you should be (unintelligible). That some of these should be (unintelligible).

(Liz): Other discussion on this, please?

A way forward, suggestion on the way forward?

Man: My perspective, (Liz), the way forward is to not be talking about, you know, dropping things in or out, but how we're going to represent the views of this group in regards to these reports?

And if we're going to be dropping things in and out then, you know, then we need to have this discussion. But I think the likely solution is, no, we're not dropping anything in or out or making any kind of, you know, conclusion about that with simply going to be reporting on.

You know, here's the (unintelligible) of the individuals in this group and amongst those, how they were ranked, whatever, but not, you know, throwing out something based on rankings and not throwing out others based in the fact that the majority don't report it at all.

(Steve): This is (Steve). Can I get in on this, (Liz)?

(Liz): Sure. Anyone else before I turn to (Steve)?

Okay, (Steve), please.

(Steve): When you look down one column, I think there's a real hazard if you can (just) read the rankings.

If you look down one column and count the number of no's, six of the no's that (Tim's) relying on and coming up with this analysis are people that said no to everything. They made no effort to discern between studies that might be somewhat useful or completely un-useful of things that are ranked by...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...ranked their characterization, (Steve)...

((Crosstalk))

(Steve): ...flat out no that (unintelligible).

So I think that we have to definitely note the preference of six people here or no studies at all, and maybe that's the first thing we do to say that six people want no studies at all.

And then, looking at those who voted with regard to some prioritization, then analyze those numbers to discover the priority order. It may will be that six complete no's to any studies would carry the day with council. I don't know.

But if they look past the six people that said no to everything, then we can look more carefully at the remaining people who actually did prioritize and under that basis...

((Crosstalk))

(Steve): ...(going to survive).

Man: That's my concern, (Steve).

((Crosstalk))

Man: We don't characterize things in that way to say that, you know, we look past to people who said nothing should be done. That's not a fair

characterization of (unintelligible) that somehow we didn't give it any thought. We just decide to say no to everything. You know better than that.

And hopefully in the final report will, you know, not reflect that kind of cold minded ideas. We - I gave it - personally, I can tell you, I give a lot of thoughts, and I still don't go - any of these studies need to be pursued, you know, the expressed why a number of times.

And to be characterized, there's just - well we've got to look pass that. This is the kind of thing that I'm concerned about and that doesn't - but I don't see - I hope it doesn't end up in the final report.

Stéphane: (Liz), can I get in there? Stéphane.

(Liz): Sure, Stéphane.

Stéphane: Just to say that it does feel important it does to me, anyway, it's really important that we do include all views.

We've had this discussion a number of times during these calls, and it's clear that some people don't feel any study should be done while others feel some or all studies are worthwhile looking at.

And I certainly agree that those people that don't feel any study should be done shouldn't be characterized as not being fully part of the group or not being on board as it were.

I just feel that we have a summary of what everyone thought in the draft tally that you've provided us and that speaks for itself really. Why do we have to have a debate on what we put forward or not?

I mean, it's quite clear that if we build our report around this tally, we will have a good cross-section of everyone's opinion in the group, and it's - what's the problem in saying that x number of people thought no study should be done and y number of people thought that three groups or constituents sees we're worth looking at and another number of people thought this should be done. Why can't we just report it that way?

(Wendy): This is (Wendy).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah.

(Wendy): You know, I think that we should go back to where this study is going and how we can be or where this report is going and how we can be helpful to council.

And I think following on the last speaker's suggestion that we're about at the point where we have contributed whatever this group can, but we've got a tally of what the participants here think. We've got the expressions that they have put forward about why they favor particular studies.

And I don't sense that we're getting any closer to consensus among this group or to a consensus that would be useful to council and decide and whether it wants to ask for any more studies or which ones.

So I would suggest that we report this, and so the fact that it's not a consensus is what it is.

(Liz): (Tim), when you are talking just a moment ago about focusing on, you know, what we're going to say in the report, is that kind of where you're headed to, what, you know, (Wendy) and Stéphanewere (unintelligible) up?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I think that they put it very well. You know, I think the group pretty much done. I mean - and it could go off on - to skew off on to this, you know, trying to now, you know, tally the rankings and map with a single, you know, list that have some kind of consensus (unintelligible) I think we're going to get there. And if we do, what's going to happen is a good number of people involved in it, (they're new), they're just - could be considered as what, you know, what others make.

(Liz): Yeah.

Well I definitely wasn't thinking that we would be able to use the tallies as a means of concluding exclusively what the recommendation would be in terms of driving to a consensus view.

But I was thinking that among those who thought studies ought to be done that in a sense there would be - definitely the report would convey a plurality of use.

So I think, you know, I wasn't naïve enough to think (unintelligible) have a plurality of use, but I did previously think.

And so I just want to throw this out and talk a little bit about it that there would be a way to say, okay, there was, you know, forget the numbers from the majority significant number of people who (unintelligible) so it should be done and this is why and then of the, you know, studies that were considered and those who thought studies should be done, here's the rough cut of what those people thought the priority (unintelligible) would be.

So it would still be up to the councils to weigh whether studies should be done or not and through a way of articulating the opinions of the group that was viewed by the group as fair, but where there would also be whether it's a minority view or not some, you know, ranking or assessment because there are so many different study proposals out there if they're going to do any studies at all here or one that would actually (unintelligible) at least the minority or a significant number or whatever the right adjective is would say ought to be done.

Now, that may not be possible. That's a further level of agreement that just may not exist, but that's what I was thinking (initially).

So, you know, of those who are kind of saying we are where we are, (Tim) and others...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): ...you know, you're saying that's not really a worthwhile effort is what I hear you saying, which is fine. I just want to understand it.

Man: Not being it's not a worthwhile effort. I think that - but I just think that you have what you need to do that and when we're talking about minority and majority views that we - in order you want to call it votes or not or whatever, that the majority and minority views are appropriately reflected...

Woman: Uh-huh.

Man: ...based on these categories.

Woman: Okay. Well...

(Steve): (Liz), this is (Steve), can I answer that?

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Sure.

(Wendy): And (Wendy).

(Liz): Okay. (Steve) and then (Wendy).

(Steve): I would just say that by using the word "majority," I think that messes it a bit because you would say that six of eight felt that no studies - none of these studies should be done.

And I - and I accept (Tim's) statement that there's varying degrees of no in each of that and that a lot of thought went into the each no, but at least the data that I had was they were all no's. So six of eight, not a majority said no to everything, six is the total.

Eight had at least some studies they felt should be done and some that they felt should not and had priority orders, and I don't think that the second category, discussing the second category, those who did have priority order, I don't think that diminishes the - in any way, the voice of the six who said no to everything.

If we also take a look at the eight who at least (unintelligible) so a majority did not say no to everything, the majority did try to discern between the studies. Thank you.

(Liz): So, (Steve), in your view, could - is there a benefit or at least those that have an opinion about rank order to come what - and is there the potential that there could be some form of consensus that ought to be worked on or which studies might be undertaken by the (unintelligible) studies should be done.

(Steve): My answer to that is obviously, yes.

And by saying that, I don't mean to diminish the voice of those who just said no to them all. We want to list that upfront and then dive it to a discussion of the eight of us who at least said some of the studies are worth doing, and I do believe we could get closer to a consensus.

(Liz): So how does everyone feel about that?

(Wendy): So...

Man: I think that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...you will get the consensus amongst the eight, but you can't call that consensus.

(Liz): I understand.

((Crosstalk))

(Wendy): And thinking from the perspective of what the...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Hey, I'm sorry. One sec. (Tim), you want to finish? Are you done?

(Wendy): And this is (Wendy) trying to...

(Liz): Yeah, (Wendy), you're next.

(Wendy): Sure, thanks.

Man: Just that the - that for some of these reports, a majority - there is a majority but (unintelligible) they shouldn't be done (unintelligible).

(Liz): Well - and my suggestion about the terminology here when we write the report is unwieldy as it is. It's not to use words like majority or

minority, but to list the people's name or find some other way of -
because I think we want to be fair to the process.

(Wendy): (No).

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): And, (Wendy), you're next.

(Wendy): And my suggestion on process is just that I think what's useful to council is knowing the arguments and knowing where they come from and not particularly knowing of this small on representative group was that most of the people, some of the people, two of the people, none of the people, but that this is a forum for surfacing arguments and when all of those are out there, it's ultimately going to be for someone who has voting or consensus reaching authority to figure out what to make of it and...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): So I have a couple of suggestions. Does anyone have any comments first? We can take a queue if there's more discussion here.

(James): This is (James).

((Crosstalk))

(James): ...in the queue with the question.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Okay, (James) and then (Tim). Anyone else?

Okay, (James)?

(James): Just procedural question. Are we maintaining (Krista's) ranking as well or are those going to be thrown out in the final report?

(Liz): We can discuss it. She - I told her they'd be deleted at her request.

(James): Thank you.

Stéphane: Yeah, (Liz), this is Stéphane again.

(Liz): Yeah.

Stéphane: If (Krista) did request vital replies or responses to be deleted, then surely, that's what we should do (unintelligible).

(Liz): Right, right.

(Tim), did you have more?

Tim Ruiz: I just wanted to say that I think (Wendy) made a reasonable suggestion.

And I don't disagree with that. And that we just, you know, and I would be (unintelligible) not using majority and minority or consensus (unintelligible) obviously not exist. And I think (Wendy) makes a good suggestion about how to frame things.

(Liz): Okay. So a couple of things I think we need to discuss. One is the report itself, and it would be very helpful to me if some of you would take the pen on certain sections.

So my thought there would be for those of you who think those study should be done if, you know, (Wendy) and (Tim) and others of that view could just draft the paragraph that explains that view that in the way that you're comfortable with for community, you know, for group consideration I would appreciate that.

I think we still have a topic on the table of - and, you know, enlist others. I don't mean to select you, but it's just my thought.

Those - we still have to talk further about whether we want to have a further discussion about the studies that ought to - that you all think should be done or that some of you think should be done and where those of you who think studies should be done come out and I have two thoughts about that.

One is I think it makes sense for you all to try to get together to discuss that and try to get - make sure that (Bowe), for example, can be a part of that discussion and we could try to schedule that at a time when all - and I would also suggest secondly that others who are saying that those studies should be done absolutely still participate in that discussion because I think it still have insights that are useful for those who do think studies should be done and so the - I still like to see (unintelligible) (Bianca) suggest a section of the report that says of those who feel studies should be done, here's a proposed

recommendation for priority order if you think among those - all of you that you can reach that ranking.

And we can use these calls to, you know, the next week's call to (unintelligible) deal with that. You also could do some time online between now and then to discuss the rationale for a proposed priority recommendation. But I do think we have to assume that the tally and the report with the two points of view, you know, have to be clearly articulated in the way that everyone is comfortable with.

Man: You know, (unintelligible) where I have a problem again and that's - how do you do that. You've got some you don't feel a new report should be done, that's true but when you are looking at the individual report, you have others who didn't say no reports should be done but some shouldn't, some should be and registry really didn't even rank anything. They just made some comments about certain ones. But it's not even clear how they rank. That can maybe be resolved in a discussion. But you're going to have some reports where there's, you know, 10 people who were okay with that report or wanted to see that report done, then you've got (unintelligible) there was, you know, pure support and, you know, (unintelligible) probably we're going to reflect that appropriately without this throwing out the (unintelligible). I don't - (unintelligible) six and seven as an example because, you know, clearly, at least among this group whether it's representative or not, the majority didn't see (unintelligible) should be considered.

So (unintelligible) should be done and then to rank them and it's kind of like throwing out - so they're going to be counting to rank them and we can't discount a number of people evolved and who has supported, you know, (unintelligible).

(Liz): And six stands out here because there's the extra no vote, is that what you're - like so there's the extra no vote and so that you want to wait to emphasize that there was or point out or highlight that this was less that fewer people thought this should be undertaken even if it was rated the highly hypothetically by those statistics I was done, is that the issue?

Man: I mean, if we're going to have amongst those who saw reports should be done if it's going to be a ranking of the reports, it's somehow that has to be reflected in there. There was, you know, those who didn't feel whether (unintelligible) paragraph somewhere.

Woman: Uh-huh. So I mean, my thought would be that that should be (unintelligible), you know, (unintelligible) might be the long word but noted in some clear way either in the sections that describe the opposition to doing studies or as a note to the sections that recommends that further studies be done by the subgroups I think further studies should be done. So I think that is a fair note to Number 6 because, you know, one fewer person thinks that Number 6 should be engaged in. But if there are people who think that Number 6 is a high priority for doing, then there ought to be a way to also highlight the support for that among those who think that study should be done.

So I guess what I'm acknowledging is that there's definitely going to be - this report is going to have two sections and there needs to be group participation in the separation (unintelligible) to both sections. Perhaps the initial pen can be held by two groups but when they come together in the one report, you know, we all need to have the chance to (unintelligible) combined report to make sure it is a fair articulation of

what this view is and it also (unintelligible) me that the underlying tally should be included, you know, in the report as the graphic depiction of where each representative on the team is.

(Wendy): So this is (Wendy). I'm going to have to drop off now but I will work to send you some - and the group some of my own thoughts only, why there should be no further studies.

(Liz): That would be great, (Wendy). Thank you.

(Wendy): Thanks.

(Liz): How do others feel about that way of proceeding, understanding (Tim's) reservation?

Okay. Among those who do think further studies should be done, I know (Steve) (unintelligible) has dropped, (unintelligible) what is the (unintelligible) that you think would work for you as far as trying to come to some overall consensus for those who think further studies should be done.

Who want to probably do that online with the group, do you want to get together offline and see whether, you know, in a week or so you could recheck consensus or something like it among those and come back to the group next week.

Man: (unintelligible).

Woman: Please.

Man: Okay. I would prefer that I can (unintelligible) be come back by email in maybe two days also.

Woman: Okay. And (Norbert), would you be able to work directly then also with (Steve) and (Lee) and the other (Steve) and (Bowe) and (Luke) come in to that discussion?

Norbert Klein : Yes.

Woman: (Steve), how do you feel about that?

Norbert Klein : Yes, yes.

Woman: Okay. Thank you, (Norbert). (Steve Del Bianco)?

(Steve Del Bianco): I do. I did want to ask you this, though. If (Wendy) comes back with an excellent description of why there should be no more studies and (unintelligible) we come up with a description of why we think three, four and six belong or one or another one should be there. Are these paragraphs that you would then state (unintelligible) general framework with all the background in it, (unintelligible) need to prepare standalone documents.

Woman: Well, that's a tough question, (Steve). I was thinking about this should be easier than a pause (unintelligible).

(Steve Del Bianco): I have - my suggestion is that - it's not a standalone document but paragraph that you would put in the context of your analysis.

(Liz): I would prefer that myself.

(Steve Del Bianco): With you (Wendy).

(Liz): Yeah, (Wendy) dropped off, I think. And obviously, you know, whatever overarching paragraph I come up with is subject to everybody's editing and input as well. So, you know, it's still a collective piece of work.

Any objections to proceeding on that basis. We have one report, we have two sections within (unintelligible) paragraph and the two groups will how to reach agreement on language but articulate accurately the views of the group acknowledging that we're not going to reach consensus, a full consensus of the group.

And by next week, by next Tuesday's call, (Jack) would be provided for, you know, my overarching background and your conceptions and that we would discuss and edit on the next call with the assumption that we would try to get the report completed by the 22nd (unintelligible).

Tim Ruiz: (Unintelligible), this is (Tim). I think that that sounds reasonable as long as, you know, we get into the report if, you know, we were not, you know, walking ourselves into this do or die and it's get into the report (unintelligible) that maybe, you know, something a little bit different better six the views that were, you know, (unintelligible) enough to make accommodation if...

Woman: Yeah, that's a really good point and I really support that, too, if you never know. And we - same thing with the deadline.

We want to look for this deadline. Everybody does. Okay. So next call 13th, Tuesday the 13th, same time.

We'll ask Glen to coordinate that for us. We'll look for (Jack's) paragraph from the three groups by then and active discussion on the list leading up to that. And we'll plan on word-smithing and discussing (unintelligible) (today's call).

Great. Thank you all very much. Any further comments. Okay, thanks for your participation and creative thinking.

Man: Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thanks. Bye, (Liz).

(Liz): Thanks.

Man: Thanks, (Liz).

(Liz): Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

END